

# IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

## Digital Repository

---

Retrospective Theses and Dissertations

Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and  
Dissertations

---

1963

## Mappings with small point-in-verses

Thomas John Robinson  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>



Part of the [Mathematics Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Robinson, Thomas John, "Mappings with small point-in-verses " (1963). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 2556.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/2556>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

This dissertation has been 64-3892  
microfilmed exactly as received

ROBINSON, Thomas John, 1935-  
MAPPINGS WITH SMALL POINT-INVERSES.

Iowa State University of Science and Technology  
Ph.D., 1963  
Mathematics

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

MAAPPINGS WITH SMALL POINT-INVERSES

by

Thomas John Robinson

A Dissertation Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of  
The Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Subject: Mathematics

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Head of Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Dean of Graduate College

Iowa State University  
Of Science and Technology  
Ames, Iowa

1963

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. $\alpha$ -MAPPINGS FOR ALL $\alpha$	6
III. COVERING PROPERTIES	11
IV. PRODUCT SPACES	18
V. METRIZATION AND EMBEDDING	23
A. Metrization and Generalizations and the Countability Axioms	23
B. An Embedding Theorem	27
VI. QUOTIENT SPACES AND TOPOLOGICAL GROUPS	31
A. Quotient Spaces	31
B. Topological Groups	34
VII. LITERATURE CITED	39
VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT	40

## I. INTRODUCTION

In their book, Dimension Theory, Hurewicz and Wallman (7) define an  $\epsilon$ -mapping of a compact metric space  $X$  into a metric space  $Y$  as follows.

Definition 1.1: A mapping  $f$ , i.e. a continuous function, of a compact metric space  $X$  into a metric space  $Y$  is an  $\epsilon$ -mapping if and only if the inverse image of every point of  $f(X)$  has diameter less than  $\epsilon$ .

This concept of  $\epsilon$ -mapping is then used to prove that a compact separable metric space having dimension  $\leq n$  is homeomorphic to a subset of  $I_{2n+1}$ . However, to prove that an arbitrary separable metric space of dimension  $\leq n$  is homeomorphic to a subset of  $I_{2n+1}$ ,  $\epsilon$ -mappings are inadequate. Thus the following generalization arises.

Definition 1.2: Let  $\alpha$  be an open covering of a space  $X$  and  $f$  a mapping of  $X$  into a space  $Y$ . Then  $f$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping if and only if there is an open cover  $\mu$  of  $Y$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu)$  refines  $\alpha$ . Equivalently,  $f$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping if and only if every point of  $Y$  has a neighborhood in  $Y$  whose inverse image is entirely contained in some member of  $\alpha$ .

This definition is applicable not only to metric spaces, but to more general topological spaces as well, and it is this definition that forms the basis for this paper.

Maxwell (10) defines a partial ordering on topological spaces in terms of  $\alpha$ -mappings as given in the following definition.

Definition 1.3: Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be topological spaces. We say  $X \leq Y$  if and only if for every open cover  $\alpha$  of  $X$  there is an  $\alpha$ -mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$ .

It is easy to see that this relation is transitive.

Maxwell investigates certain properties of spaces which are

"inherited" under this relation. Most of them are listed in the theorem below.

Theorem 1.4: If  $X \leq Y$ , then:

- (1) If  $X$  or  $Y$  is compact, both are.
- (2) If  $X$  or  $Y$  is connected, both are.
- (3) If  $Y$  is paracompact, then  $X$  is paracompact.
- (4) If  $Y$  is Lindelöf, then  $X$  is Lindelöf.
- (5)  $\dim X \leq \dim Y$ .
- (6) If  $X$  is  $T_1$  and  $Y$  is  $T_2$ , then  $X$  is  $T_2$ .
- (7) If  $X$  is  $T_1$  and  $Y$  is regular, then  $X$  is regular.
- (8) If  $X$  is  $T_1$  and  $Y$  is completely regular, then  $X$  is completely regular.
- (9) If  $Y$  is normal, then  $X$  is normal.

A question asked by Ulam in his problem book (14) concerns the invariance of the fixed point property under this order relation. Maxwell proves the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5: If  $X$  and  $Y$  are metric absolute neighborhood retracts with  $X \leq Y$ , and  $Y$  has the fixed point property, then  $X$  has the fixed point property.

To conclude his results, Maxwell gives examples to show that  $X \leq Y$  does not imply that  $X$  have the same homotopy type nor the same dimension as  $Y$ .

Another of Ulam's questions is the following: Does there exist for every  $\epsilon > 0$  an  $\epsilon$ -map of the disk onto the torus? M. K. Fort, Jr. (3) and T. Ganea (4) have both given negative answers to this question using

different methods. Ganea used Čech cohomology and also proves that if  $Y$  is a compact  $n$ -dimensional manifold and  $X$  is an absolute neighborhood retract with  $X \leq Y$ , then  $X$  has the same homotopy type as an  $n$ -manifold. Fort uses arcs to obtain his results, and it seems worthy of mention that he shows for  $\epsilon < 1/6$  there is no  $\epsilon$ -mapping of a unit disk onto a torus.

A third question asked by Ulam with regard to  $\alpha$ -maps and the order relation  $\leq$  involves  $X \leq Y$  and  $Y \leq X$ . He asks whether  $X$  and  $Y$  are then homeomorphic if they are  $n$ -manifolds. In addition to his result noted above, Fort shows that if  $X \leq Y$  and  $Y \leq X$  where  $X$  and  $Y$  are closed, orientable, 2-manifolds, then  $X$  and  $Y$  are homeomorphic. Somewhat along this same line, Borsuk (2) has given an example of compact spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  such that for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an  $\epsilon$ -mapping of  $X$  into  $Y$  and vice versa.  $X$  and  $Y$  are both subsets of  $E_3$  with  $X$  being homeomorphic to a subspace of the plane while  $Y$  is not.

In this paper we will consider the more general concept of  $\alpha$ -mappings and the relation  $\leq$  as given in Definition 1.3. In Chapter II the significance of  $f$  being an  $\alpha$ -mapping for every open cover  $\alpha$  of  $X$  is investigated. In the process it is found that if  $X$  is a  $T_1$  space and  $f$  an  $\alpha$ -mapping of  $X$  onto  $Y$  for all  $\alpha$ , then  $f$  is a homeomorphism, while if  $X$  is not  $T_1$ , then the topology of  $Y$  is not determined by the topology of  $X$ .

Chapter III is a study of covering properties of spaces and their inheritance under the relation  $\leq$ . The results of Theorem 1.4 are extended to include metacompactness, countable paracompactness, compactness of degree  $\gamma$ , and  $\gamma$ -reducibility.

Results similar to those of Chapter III and some of those of Theorem 1.4 can be obtained. Thus if  $\mathcal{P}$  represents one of the properties of being

compact, Lindelöf, etc., and if for every open cover  $\alpha$  of  $X$  there is an  $\alpha$ -mapping  $f_\alpha$  of  $X$  onto a space  $Y_\alpha$  having property  $\mathcal{P}$ , then  $X$  has property  $\mathcal{P}$ .

The chief results of Chapter IV are  $\overline{\bigcap_{a \in A} X_a} \leq \overline{\bigcap_{a \in A} Y_a}$  if for each  $a \in A$   $X_a$  is compact and  $X_a \leq Y_a$ , and a partial converse of this.

Chapter V is divided into two parts, the first dealing with metrization, generalizations, and the countability axioms, and the second with an embedding theorem. In the first part it is shown that if  $X \leq Y$  the property of being a uniform space is inherited when  $X$  is  $T_1$ , but metrizability, developability, and the countability axioms are not. The chief result of the second part is that the  $\alpha$ -mappings of a  $T_1$  space induce an embedding of the domain space into the product of the range spaces. When applied to theorems of Ponomarev (12), this embedding gives rise to necessary and sufficient conditions for a  $T_1$  space to be paracompact or Lindelöf.

Chapter VI has an application of the embedding of Chapter V which gives an isomorphism of a compact topological group onto the inverse limit of an inverse system of factor groups. This is done after proving that if  $G$  is a compact group with arbitrarily small invariant subgroups  $\{G_a\}_{a \in A}$ , then for each open cover  $\alpha$  of  $G$  there is an  $a \in A$  such that the natural mapping of  $G$  onto  $G/G_a$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping. The first part of Chapter VI deals with quotient spaces, and a method is given for constructing spaces  $X$  and  $Y$  such that  $X \leq Y$  and  $Y \leq X$  but  $X$  and  $Y$  are not homeomorphic.

Most of the definitions will be stated as they are needed. The terminology and notation are similar to what is used in most topology



books. For example, see Hocking and Young (6) or Kelley (8). An exception to the terminology of Kelley is that the term "neighborhood" as used here is an "open neighborhood" in his book.

II.  $\alpha$ -MAPPINGS FOR ALL  $\alpha$ 

Let  $X$  be a topological space and let  $\Sigma(X)$  be the family of open covers of  $X$ . For  $\alpha, \mu \in \Sigma(X)$  we will write  $\mu R \alpha$  if and only if  $\mu$  refines  $\alpha$ . Then  $R$  is a partial ordering in the terminology of Kelley (8, p. 13), for he only requires  $R$  to be a transitive relation. Other authors have a slightly more restrictive definition of partial ordering (5, p. 275). They require that  $\mu R \alpha$  and  $\alpha R \mu$  imply  $\mu = \alpha$ , but of course this does not follow for refinements.

Let  $(X, \tau)$  and  $(Y, \sigma)$  be topological spaces and  $f$  a mapping of  $(X, \tau)$  onto  $(Y, \sigma)$ . Then since  $f^{-1}(\sigma) \subset \tau$ , it follows that  $f^{-1}$  induces an order preserving function, also denoted by  $f^{-1}$ , of  $\Sigma(Y, \sigma)$  into  $\Sigma(X, \tau)$ . Thus if  $\alpha, \mu \in \Sigma(Y, \sigma)$  such that  $\alpha R \mu$ , then  $f^{-1}(\alpha) R f^{-1}(\mu)$ .  $f^{-1}$  also preserves such properties as local finiteness, a concept that will be encountered in Chapter III.

We also note that if  $f$  maps a space  $X$  onto a space  $Y$  and  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$ , then  $f^{-1}(\mu) \in \Sigma(X)$ . If  $\alpha$  is a subcover of  $f^{-1}(\mu)$ , then we construct a subcover  $\mu'$  of  $\mu$  by letting  $U \in \mu'$  if and only if  $f^{-1}(U) \in \alpha$ . Since  $f$  is onto,  $f(f^{-1}(U)) = U$  for each  $U \in \mu$  and hence cardinal  $\mu' \leq$  cardinal  $\alpha$ . This is used in the proofs of some of the theorems of Chapter III.

Let  $X \leq Y$  and  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . Then if  $\mu \in \Sigma(X)$  such that  $\mu R \alpha$ , a  $\mu$ -mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  is also an  $\alpha$ -mapping. Under this particular relation  $R$ , if  $\alpha, \mu \in \Sigma(X)$ , then there is a  $\lambda \in \Sigma(X)$  such that  $\lambda R \alpha$  and  $\lambda R \mu$ ; i.e.  $(\Sigma(X), R)$  is a directed set. Hence it follows that for each  $\alpha, \mu \in \Sigma(X)$  there is a mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  which is both an  $\alpha$ -map and a  $\mu$ -map. It is easily seen that this can be extended to any finite collection of elements of

$\Sigma(X)$ . Hence if  $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subset \Sigma(X)$ , there is a mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  such that  $f$  is an  $\alpha_i$ -mapping for all  $i \leq n$ .

We actually get some slightly stronger statements than that mentioned in the last sentence of the preceding paragraph. These are stated as a theorem, but the easy proof will be omitted.

**Theorem 2.1:** Let  $X \leq Y$  and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$  be any finite subcollection of  $\Sigma(X)$  with  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n$  corresponding  $\alpha_i$ -mappings of  $X$  onto  $Y$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . If  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  are open covers of  $Y$  such that  $f_i^{-1}(\mu_i) R \alpha_i$ , then there exists a  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  and a mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  such that  $\mu R \mu_i$  and  $f^{-1}(\mu) R \alpha_i$  for each  $i \leq n$ .

In this hierarchy of refinements and  $\alpha$ -mappings there is one important question that will be examined closely. Thus we ask, "What is the significance of the existence of a  $\lambda$  in  $\Sigma(X)$  such that  $\lambda R \alpha$  for every  $\alpha$  in  $\Sigma(X)$ , or a mapping  $f$  which is an  $\alpha$ -map for all  $\alpha$  in  $\Sigma(X)$ ?" Of course if the former condition is satisfied, then the latter condition will also be satisfied. The converse is not true, however. We will consider a theorem and some examples involving specific questions applied to the domain and range spaces, and functions which are  $\alpha$ -mappings for all  $\alpha$  in  $\Sigma(X)$ .

**Theorem 2.2:** Let  $X \leq Y$  where  $X$  is  $T_1$ , and let  $f$  be an  $\alpha$ -mapping for all  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . Then  $f$  is a homeomorphism.

**Proof:** To show that  $f$  is one to one, suppose there are distinct points  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  such that  $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ .  $X$  is  $T_1$  and hence there is a neighborhood  $U$  of  $x_1$  such that  $x_2 \notin U$ . Let  $\alpha = \{U, X - \{x_1\}\}$ . Then  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  and hence there is a  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu) R \alpha$ . If  $V$  is any member of  $\mu$  that contains  $f(x_1)$ , then  $f^{-1}(V) \subset U$ , for  $x_1 \notin X - \{x_1\}$ . But

since  $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ ,  $x_2 \in f^{-1}(V)$ , hence  $x_2 \in U$ . This is a contradiction and it follows that  $f$  is one to one.

Let  $U$  be an open set in  $X$ . We will show that  $f(U)$  is open. Let  $x$  be any point of  $U$ . Then  $\alpha = \{U, X - \{x\}\}$  is in  $\Sigma(X)$  and hence there is a  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha$ . If  $V$  is any member of  $\mu$  that contains  $f(x)$ , then  $f^{-1}(V) \subset U$ , and since  $f(f^{-1}(V)) = V$ ,  $V$  is a subset of  $f(U)$ . Hence there is a neighborhood  $V$  of  $f(x)$  that is contained in  $f(U)$ . Hence  $f(U)$  is open and since  $U$  is arbitrary,  $f$  is an open mapping. Therefore, since  $f$  is one to one, onto, and open, it is a homeomorphism.

**Corollary 2.3:** If  $X \leq Y$  and  $X$  is discrete, then  $Y$  is discrete.

**Proof:** If  $\alpha$  is the member of  $\Sigma(X)$  consisting of singleton sets, then  $\alpha R \mu$  for all  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$ . The proof then follows from Theorem 2.2.

If  $X \leq Y$  and  $Y$  is discrete, then it doesn't follow that  $X$  need be discrete, however. For let  $X$  be a two point indiscrete space,  $Y$  a singleton set, and  $f$  the mapping of  $X$  onto  $Y$ .

In view of Theorem 2.2, we are led to the following: Let  $X \leq Y$  where  $X$  is not  $T_1$ , and let  $f$  be an  $\alpha$ -mapping for every  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . Is  $f$  necessarily open, or closed, or one to one?

A simple example shows that  $f$  need not have any of these properties. Let  $X = \{a, b, c\}$  with open sets  $\emptyset$ ,  $\{a\}$ ,  $\{a, b\}$ , and  $X$ . Let  $Y = \{d, e\}$  with open sets  $\emptyset$  and  $Y$ . Then since  $X \in \alpha$  for every  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ , every mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping for all  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . It is easily seen that each such mapping  $f$  satisfies none of the properties of being open, or closed, or one to one.

Along this same line we consider another question: Let  $X \leq Y$  where

$X$  is not  $T_1$ , and let  $f$  be an  $\alpha$ -mapping for every  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . Suppose that in addition there is a  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu) R \alpha$  for every  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . What is the significance of this latter property?

From the above example we see that this additional condition does not force the mapping  $f$  to be open, closed, or one to one. However, we can say that  $\Sigma(X)$  has an element which is "minimal" in a certain way, namely  $f^{-1}(\mu) R \alpha$  for every  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . This minimal element may not be the open cover which contains the most elements, as is also seen in the above example, nor does it have to be the open cover with the fewest elements.

If  $f$  is a function on a space  $X$  onto a set  $Y$ , there are topologies which can be put on  $Y$  to make the function  $f$  continuous. The largest such topology is called the quotient topology. Thus  $U$  is open in the quotient topology if and only if  $f^{-1}(U)$  is open in  $X$ . If  $f$  is a one to one function then the set  $Y$  with the quotient topology relative to  $X$  and  $f$  is just a homeomorphic copy of  $X$ .

We have shown in Theorem 2.2 that if  $X \leq Y$ ,  $X$  is  $T_1$ , and  $f$  an  $\alpha$ -mapping for all  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ , then the topology on  $Y$  is directly determined by  $f$  and  $X$ . If  $X \leq Y$ ,  $X$  is not  $T_1$ , and  $f$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping for all  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ , then by the above example the topology on  $Y$  is in general not determined directly by  $f$  and  $X$  since  $f$  need not be a homeomorphism. The question remains, however, whether the topology on  $Y$  is indirectly determined via the quotient topology of  $f$  and  $X$ .

Since the quotient topology is the largest topology for which  $f$  is continuous, it is true, of course, that every member of the given topology is also a member of the quotient topology. The following example shows

that this is nearly all that can be said about them in general.

Example 2.4: Let  $X$  be the reals with a basis for  $X$  the family of all closed right rays, i.e.  $U = \{x: x \geq b \text{ for some } b\}$ . Let  $Y$  be the reals with a basis the family of all open right rays.

The identity mapping  $i$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping for all  $\alpha$  in  $\Sigma(X)$ . Furthermore, the family  $\mu$  of all open right rays is a refinement of each  $\alpha$  in  $\Sigma(X)$ . As we observed above, the set  $Y$  with the quotient topology of  $i$  is just  $X$  since  $i$  is one to one. However, since closed right rays are not open in the given topology on  $Y$ , the given topology and the quotient topology are not equivalent.

## III. COVERING PROPERTIES

As we have seen in Theorem 1.4, when  $X \leq Y$  and  $Y$  is compact, paracompact or Lindelöf, then  $X$  has the same property. These three concepts are defined in terms of subcovers or refinements of open covers. There are other properties which are somewhat similar to the three listed above, and these are quite easily shown to be inherited under the relation  $\leq$ .

While countable compactness is not defined explicitly in terms of open covers, we will begin with a theorem on countable compactness. By definition a subset  $A$  of a space  $X$  is countably compact if and only if every infinite subset of  $A$  has at least one limit point in  $A$  (5, p. 66).

Theorem 3.1: Let  $Y$  be  $T_0$  and countably compact. Suppose  $Y$  has the additional property that the intersection of each local base contains at most two points. Then if  $X \leq Y$ ,  $X$  is also countably compact.

Remark: An example of a space  $Y$  which is not  $T_1$  but has this local base restriction is obtained by considering a three point space  $Y = \{a, b, c\}$  with open sets  $\emptyset$ ,  $\{a, b\}$ ,  $\{b, c\}$ ,  $\{b\}$ , and  $Y$ .

Proof of Theorem: Let  $A$  be an infinite subset of  $X$  and suppose that  $A$  has no limit point in  $X$ . Then  $A$  is closed and  $X - A$  is an open set which contains no points of  $A$ . Since  $A$  has no limit point, then in particular no point of  $A$  is a limit point of  $A$ . Thus if  $x \in A$ , there is a neighborhood  $U(x)$  of  $x$  such that  $U(x) \cap A = \{x\}$ . Let  $\alpha = \{X - A, \{U(x)\}_{x \in A}\}$ . Then  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  and there is a mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  and a  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu) R \alpha$ .

We now show that  $f|_A$  is one to one. From the above observations  $A$  as a subspace of  $X$  is discrete and  $\alpha' = \alpha \cap A = \{U: U = V \cap A \text{ for some } V \in \alpha\}$

is the discrete cover of  $A$ . Hence  $f$  is an  $\alpha'$ -map of  $A$  onto  $f(A)$  for all  $\alpha' \in \Sigma(A)$  and by Theorem 2.2,  $A$  and  $f(A)$  are homeomorphic. Therefore,  $B_1 = f(A)$  is an infinite subset of  $Y$  and from the above remarks it follows that no point of  $B_1$  is a limit point of  $B_1$ , and that no member of  $\mu$  contains more than one point of  $B_1$ .

To complete the proof we will show that there is a sequence of distinct limit points of  $B_1$  which does not itself have a limit point in  $Y$ , and hence have a contradiction of the assumption that  $Y$  is countably compact.

Since  $B_1$  is infinite and  $Y$  is countably compact, there is a point  $b_{01}$  in  $Y$  which is a limit point of  $B_1$ . Then every neighborhood of  $b_{01}$  contains at least one point  $b_1 \in B_1$  such that  $b_{01} \neq b_1$ . From our observations above we have that  $b_{01} \notin B_1$ , and it also follows that  $b_{01}$  is a limit point of a singleton set  $\{b_1\}$ . Since  $Y$  is  $T_0$  there is a neighborhood  $V(b_1)$  of  $b_1$  which does not contain  $b_{01}$ , and hence  $b_1$  is not a limit point of the singleton set  $\{b_{01}\}$ . This will be used in showing that no point of  $B_1$  is a limit point of the sequence to be constructed.

Now consider the set  $B_2 = B_1 - \{b_1\}$ .  $B_2$  is infinite and hence has at least one limit point, call it  $b_{02}$ .  $b_{02} \notin B_1$ , and  $b_{02} \neq b_{01}$  because there are no points of  $B_1$  other than  $b_1$  in any element of  $\mu$  that contains  $b_{01}$ . It also follows that  $b_{02}$  is a limit point of a singleton set  $\{b_2\}$  in  $B_2$ , while  $b_2$  is not a limit point of the singleton set  $\{b_{02}\}$ .

Having obtained the distinct limit points  $b_{01}$  and  $b_{02}$  of  $\{b_1\}$  and  $\{b_2\}$ , respectively, we proceed inductively to obtain  $B_{n+1} = B_n - \{b_n\}$ , and the point  $b_{0n+1}$  which is a limit point of  $B_{n+1}$ . By the induction



process we obtain a sequence of distinct points  $\{b_{0n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ , each of which is a limit point of a singleton set  $\{b_n\}$  which is a point of  $B_n$  (but not of  $B_k$  for  $k > n$ ). The infinite set  $\{b_{0n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  must have a limit point also, but we will show that this is impossible and hence have our contradiction.

Let  $b_0$  be a limit point of  $\{b_{0n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ . Either  $b_0$  is in  $B_1$ , or it is not in  $B_1$  but is a limit point of  $B_1$ . Suppose first that  $b_0 \in B_1$ . Every neighborhood of  $b_0$  contains a point  $b_{0k}$  in  $\{b_{0n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ , and because of the form of  $\mu$ ,  $b_0$  must be a limit point of a singleton set  $\{b_{0k}\}$ . From our previous observations  $b_0 \neq b_k$ , and hence there is an element of  $\mu$  that contains the points  $b_0$  and  $b_k$  of  $B_1$  which is a contradiction.

Next we assume that  $b_0$  is a limit point of  $B_1$  in addition to being a limit point of  $\{b_{0n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ . Since  $b_0$  is a limit point of a singleton set  $\{b_{0m}\}$  for some  $m$ , then given any neighborhood  $V(b_0)$  of  $b_0$  the point  $b_{0m}$  in  $\{b_{0n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  and the corresponding point in  $B_1$ ,  $b_m$ , are in  $V(b_0)$ . However, by hypothesis there is a neighborhood of each of these three points which contains at most one of the other two. Hence we have a contradiction.

Thus we have shown that the infinite set of distinct points  $\{b_{0n}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  does not have a limit point in  $Y$  which contradicts the assumption that  $Y$  is countably compact. Therefore  $A$  has a limit point in  $X$ , and since  $A$  is arbitrary,  $X$  is countably compact.

Two results arise due to Theorem 3.1, one from the separation hypothesis and the other from the proof of the theorem. We state them both in the following corollary.

Corollary 3.2: If  $X \leq Y$ ,  $Y$  is countably compact and either  $T_1$  or

satisfies the condition that each limit point of a subset is an accumulation point of that subset, then  $X$  is countably compact.

The restrictions placed on  $Y$  in Theorem 3.1 are sufficient to prove the theorem. It appears that if  $Y$  is  $T_0$  and there is an integer  $n$  such that the intersection of each local base in  $Y$  contains at most  $n$  points, then the theorem is still true. We have been unable to construct either a proof or a counterexample for  $Y$  only  $T_0$ . The following example shows, however, that if  $Y$  satisfies the local base condition but is not  $T_0$ , then the theorem is false.

**Example 3.3:** Let  $Y$  be the set of positive integers with a basis for  $Y$  the sets of the form  $\{2n-1, 2n\}$  for  $n$  any positive integer. Let  $X$  be the positive integers with a basis for  $X$  the sets of the form  $\{2n-1, 2n\}$  or  $\{2n\}$  for  $n$  any positive integer. Define  $f$  on  $X$  onto  $Y$  by letting  $f(x) = x$  for all  $x \in X$ . Then  $f$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping for all  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ , for each set  $\{2n-1, 2n\}$  is contained in some member of  $\alpha$ . Hence  $X \leq Y$ . Clearly  $Y$  is countably compact, for the point  $2n$  is a limit point of the singleton set  $\{2n-1\}$  and conversely  $2n-1$  is a limit point of the singleton set  $\{2n\}$ . However, the infinite set of odd integers,  $\{2n-1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ , has no limit point in  $X$  and thus  $X$  is not countably compact.

**Definition 3.4:** A family of subsets of a space  $X$  is point finite if and only if no point of  $X$  belongs to more than a finite number of members of the family. A space is metacompact if and only if each open cover of  $X$  has a point finite refinement (8, p. 171).

**Theorem 3.5:** Let  $X \leq Y$  and let  $Y$  be metacompact. Then  $X$  is metacompact.

**Proof:** Let  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . Then there is a mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  and a

$\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha$ . Since  $Y$  is metacompact  $\mu$  has a point finite refinement  $\mu'$ . But then  $f^{-1}(\mu')$  is a point finite refinement of  $\alpha$ .  $\alpha$  is arbitrary and hence  $X$  is metacompact.

**Definition 3.6:** A family of subsets of a space  $X$  is called locally finite if and only if for each  $x \in X$  there is a neighborhood  $U(x)$  of  $x$  such that  $U(x)$  intersects only a finite number of members of the family. A space  $X$  is (countably) paracompact if and only if each (countable) open cover of  $X$  has a locally finite refinement.

Before stating a theorem on countable compactness, it appears convenient to introduce some further concepts involving open covers.

**Definition 3.7:** Let  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  and let  $x \in X$  be any point. Then  $\alpha^*(x)$ , the star of  $\alpha$  with respect to  $x$ , is defined by  $\alpha^*(x) = \bigcup_{x \in U, U \in \alpha} U$ . Then  $\alpha^*$ , the  $\alpha$  star cover of  $X$ , is defined by  $\alpha^* = \{U: \text{for some } x \in U, U = \alpha^*(x)\}$ . If  $f$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping of  $X$  onto  $Y$  for some  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ , and if  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  is such that  $f^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha$ , we define the  $\alpha$ -restricted  $\mu$  star cover,  $\mu_\alpha^*$ , by  $\mu_\alpha^* = \{U: \text{for some } A \in \alpha, U = \bigcup_{f(A) \supset V \in \mu} V\}$ .

**Theorem 3.8:** Let  $X \leq Y$  and  $Y$  be countably paracompact. Then  $X$  is countably paracompact.

**Proof:** Let  $\alpha$  be any countable open cover of  $X$ . There is a mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  and a  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha$ .  $\alpha$  is countable and it follows from its construction that  $\mu_\alpha^*$  is also countable and  $f^{-1}(\mu_\alpha^*)R\alpha$ .

Since  $\mu$  is an open cover of  $Y$  and  $f^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha$ , it follows that  $\mu_\alpha^*$  is an open cover of  $Y$ .  $Y$  is countably paracompact and so the countable open cover  $\mu_\alpha^*$  of  $Y$  has a locally finite refinement, call it  $\mu'$ .  $f^{-1}$  preserves refinement, openness, and local finiteness, and since  $\alpha$  is arbitrary  $X$  is

countably paracompact.

A slight variation of the above proof is used to obtain the corresponding theorem for paracompactness.

**Definition 3.9:** A subset  $A$  of a space  $X$  is compact of degree  $\gamma$  if and only if every open cover of  $A$  contains a subcovering of cardinal  $\leq \gamma$  (9, p. 24).

**Definition 3.10:** A space  $X$  is  $\gamma$ -reducible if and only if every  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  of cardinal  $\gamma$  has a subcover of cardinal  $< \gamma$ .

We observe that Lindelöf spaces coincide with spaces which are compact of degree  $\aleph_0$ , and which are  $\gamma$ -reducible for every uncountable cardinal  $\gamma$ . It is also true that a  $T_1$  space is countably compact if and only if it is  $\gamma$ -reducible for every countably infinite cardinal  $\gamma$ . Furthermore, a space is compact if and only if it is  $\gamma$ -reducible for every infinite cardinal  $\gamma$ , or compact of degree  $\gamma$  for  $\gamma$  finite.

**Theorem 3.11:** Let  $X \leq Y$ . Then if either  $X$  or  $Y$  is compact of degree  $\gamma$ , both of them are.

**Proof:** Suppose first that  $Y$  is compact of degree  $\gamma$  and let  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . Then there is a mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  and a  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha$ . Since  $Y$  is compact of degree  $\gamma$ ,  $\mu$  has a subcover  $\mu'$  of cardinal  $\leq \gamma$ . Since  $\mu'R_\mu$ ,  $f^{-1}(\mu')R\alpha$ .

We construct a subcover  $\alpha'$  of  $\alpha$  by extracting elements from  $\alpha$  in the following manner. For each element  $V$  of  $\mu'$ , select exactly one element  $U$  from  $\alpha$  such that  $f^{-1}(V) \subset U$ . The subcover  $\alpha'$  thus obtained has cardinal  $\leq$  cardinal  $\mu' \leq \gamma$ .  $\alpha$  is arbitrary and hence  $X$  is compact of degree  $\gamma$ .

Suppose now that  $X$  is compact of degree  $\gamma$  and let  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  be

arbitrary. Then if  $f$  is any mapping of  $X$  onto  $Y$ ,  $f^{-1}(\mu) \in \Sigma(X)$ . Since  $X$  is compact of degree  $\gamma$ , there is a subcovering  $\alpha$  of  $f^{-1}(\mu)$  of cardinal  $\leq \gamma$ . But then, as was observed in Chapter II, the subcover  $\mu'$  of  $\mu$  consisting of elements  $U$  such that  $f^{-1}(U) \in \alpha$  has cardinal  $\leq \gamma$ . Therefore, since  $\mu$  is arbitrary,  $Y$  is compact of degree  $\gamma$ .

**Theorem 3.12:** Let  $X \leq Y$ . Then if either  $X$  or  $Y$  is  $\gamma$ -reducible, they both are.

**Proof:** Suppose first that  $Y$  is  $\gamma$ -reducible, and let  $\alpha$  be any member of  $\Sigma(X)$  of cardinal  $\gamma$ . Then there is a mapping  $f$  of  $X$  onto  $Y$  and a  $\mu \in \Sigma(Y)$  such that  $f^{-1}(\mu) \cap \alpha \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $\mu_\alpha^*$  has cardinal  $\leq \gamma$  and  $f^{-1}(\mu_\alpha^*) \cap \alpha \neq \emptyset$ .

Suppose first that the cardinal of  $\mu_\alpha^*$  is  $\gamma$ .  $Y$  is  $\gamma$ -reducible and hence the open cover  $\mu_\alpha^*$  has a subcover  $\mu'$  of cardinal  $< \gamma$ . Then also  $f^{-1}(\mu') \cap \alpha \neq \emptyset$ . We construct a subcover  $\alpha'$  of  $\alpha$  by selecting for each member of  $f^{-1}(\mu')$  exactly one element from  $\alpha$  which contains it. Since the cardinality of  $f^{-1}(\mu') < \gamma$ , the cardinality of  $\alpha'$  is also  $< \gamma$ . If the cardinality of  $\mu_\alpha^* < \gamma$ , then for  $\mu'$  as above we will write  $\mu' = \mu_\alpha^*$ . In either case a subcover of  $\alpha$  of cardinal  $< \gamma$  is obtained and, since  $\alpha$  is arbitrary,  $X$  is  $\gamma$ -reducible.

Suppose next that  $X$  is  $\gamma$ -reducible, and let  $\mu$  be a member of  $\Sigma(Y)$  of cardinal  $\gamma$ . Then if  $f$  is any mapping of  $X$  onto  $Y$ ,  $f^{-1}(\mu) \in \Sigma(X)$  has cardinal  $\gamma$ .  $X$  is  $\gamma$ -reducible and hence there is a subcover  $\alpha$  of  $f^{-1}(\mu)$  of cardinal  $< \gamma$ . Then let  $\mu'$  be the subcover of  $\mu$  such that  $U \in \mu'$  if and only if  $f^{-1}(U) \in \alpha$ . Thus the cardinal of  $\mu' < \gamma$  and, since  $\mu$  is arbitrary,  $Y$  is  $\gamma$ -reducible.

## IV. PRODUCT SPACES

**Definition 4.1:** Let  $f$  be a function on a set  $X$  onto a topological space  $Y$ . Then the product topology of  $f$  is the smallest topology on  $X$  such that  $f$  is continuous.

**Definition 4.2:** Let  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$  be a product of spaces and let  $\Delta \subset A$ . Define the projection  $P_\Delta$  of  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$  onto  $\prod_{a \in \Delta} X_a$  by  $P_\Delta(\{x_a\}_{a \in A}) = \{x_a\}_{a \in \Delta}$ . If  $\Delta = \{a\}$ , then  $P_a(\{x_a\}_{a \in A}) = x_a$ . The product  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$  is given the smallest topology which includes the product topology of all the  $P_a$ 's, making each  $P_a$  open and continuous. Then if  $\alpha$  is an open cover of  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$ , the projection of  $\alpha$  onto  $\prod_{a \in \Delta} X_a$  is an open cover  $\alpha_\Delta$  of  $\prod_{a \in \Delta} X_a$  defined by  $\alpha_\Delta = P_\Delta(\alpha) = \{U: \text{for some } V \in \alpha, U = P_\Delta(V)\}$ . If  $\Delta = \{a\}$ , then  $\alpha_a = P_a(\alpha)$  is an open cover of  $X_a$ .

**Definition 4.3:** Let  $A$  be an index set and suppose that for each  $a \in A$ ,  $f_a$  is a mapping of a space  $X_a$  onto a space  $Y_a$ . The product mapping  $F$  of  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$  onto  $\prod_{a \in A} Y_a$  is defined by  $F(\{x_a\}_{a \in A}) = \{f_a(x_a)\}_{a \in A}$  and we write  $F = \prod_{a \in A} f_a$ .

The following lemma gives a property of the inverse of a product mapping that is used in the proofs of some theorems on product spaces.

**Lemma 4.4:** Let  $A$  be an index set,  $f_a$  a mapping of  $X_a$  onto  $Y_a$  for each  $a \in A$ , and let  $F = \prod_{a \in A} f_a$ . Then if  $U_a \subset Y_a$  for each  $a \in A$ ,  $F^{-1}(\prod_{a \in A} U_a) = \prod_{a \in A} f_a^{-1}(U_a)$ .

**Proof:** We will prove the lemma by showing that

$$F^{-1}(\prod_{a \in A} U_a) \subset \prod_{a \in A} f_a^{-1}(U_a) \text{ and } \prod_{a \in A} f_a^{-1}(U_a) \subset F^{-1}(\prod_{a \in A} U_a).$$

These two inclusions will be obtained by writing a series of equivalent

statements.

$$\{x_a\}_{a \in A} \in F^{-1}(\prod_{a \in A} U_a)$$

if and only if  $F(\{x_a\}_{a \in A}) = \{f_a(x_a)\}_{a \in A} \in \prod_{a \in A} U_a$

if and only if  $f_a(x_a) \in U_a$  for each  $a \in A$

if and only if  $x_a \in f_a^{-1}(U_a)$  for each  $a \in A$

if and only if  $\{x_a\}_{a \in A} \in \prod_{a \in A} f_a^{-1}(U_a)$ .

**Definition 4.5:** Let  $\alpha_i$  be an open cover of  $X_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then  $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2$  is an open cover of  $X_1 \times X_2$  defined by  $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2 = \{U \times V : U \in \alpha_1, V \in \alpha_2\}$ .

We observe that if  $\alpha'_1 R \alpha_1$  and  $\alpha'_2 R \alpha_2$ , then  $(\alpha'_1 \times \alpha'_2) R (\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2)$ .

**Theorem 4.6:** Let  $X_1 \leq Y_1$  and  $X_2 \leq Y_2$ , where  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are compact. Then  $X_1 \times X_2 \leq Y_1 \times Y_2$ , and each  $\alpha$ -map may be chosen to be a product map with the corresponding  $\mu$  a product cover.

**Proof:** Let  $\alpha$  be an open cover of  $X_1 \times X_2$ . Without loss of generality we make the following assumptions about  $\alpha$ : (i). No member of  $\alpha$  is a subset of any other member of  $\alpha$ , since the removal of such a set leaves a refinement of  $\alpha$ . (ii)  $\alpha = \{U_a \times V_a\}_{a \in A}$  where  $A$  is some index set, for each open cover can be refined by a cover consisting entirely of basis elements. (iii)  $\alpha$  may be chosen to be finite since  $X_1 \times X_2$  is compact. Thus  $\alpha = \{U_1 \times V_1, U_2 \times V_2, \dots, U_n \times V_n\}$  for some integer  $n$  with each  $U_i$  open in  $X_1$  and  $V_i$  open in  $X_2$ .

We wish to find a refinement of  $\alpha$  of the form  $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2$  where  $\alpha_1 \in \Sigma(X_1)$  and  $\alpha_2 \in \Sigma(X_2)$ . We do this starting with the families  $\alpha'_1 = \{U_i\}_{i \leq n}$  and  $\alpha'_2 = \{V_i\}_{i \leq n}$  of sets which appear as first or second elements of members of  $\alpha$ .  $\alpha'_1$  and  $\alpha'_2$  are, of course, open covers of  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ ,

respectively.

For each  $x_1 \in X_1$  take the intersection of all members of  $\alpha_1'$  which contain  $x_1$ .  $\alpha_1'$  is finite and hence this intersection is an open set  $U(x_1)$  containing  $x_1$ . The family of open sets formed in this way is a finite collection  $\alpha_1 = \{U(x_{1i}) : i \leq n' \text{ for some } n' \text{ and } x_{1i} \in X_1\}$  which is an open cover of  $X_1$ . In a similar manner we obtain a finite open cover of  $X_2, \alpha_2 = \{V(x_{2i}) : i \leq m \text{ for some } m \text{ and } x_{2i} \in X_2\}$ . For  $i = 1, 2$ , we have  $\alpha_i R \alpha_i'$ .

Clearly  $\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2$  is an open cover of  $X_1 \times X_2$ . Also, if  $U(x_1) \in \alpha_1$  and  $V(x_2) \in \alpha_2$ , then  $U(x_1) \times V(x_2)$  is contained in some member of  $\alpha$ . For  $(x_1, x_2) \in U(x_1) \times V(x_2)$ , and  $U(x_1) \subset U_i$  for every  $U_i \in \alpha_1'$  which contains  $x_1$ ; and  $V(x_2) \subset V_i$  for every  $V_i \in \alpha_2'$  which contains  $x_2$ . Now  $(x_1, x_2) \in U_i \times V_i$  for some  $i$ , and since  $U(x_1) \subset U_i$ ,  $V(x_2) \subset V_i$ , it follows that  $U(x_1) \times V(x_2) \subset U_i \times V_i$ .

Since  $X_1 \leq Y_1$  and  $X_2 \leq Y_2$ , corresponding to  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  are mappings  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  and open covers  $\mu_1 \in \Sigma(Y_1)$ ,  $\mu_2 \in \Sigma(Y_2)$  such that  $f_i(X_i) = Y_i$  and  $f_i^{-1}(\mu_i) R \alpha_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Then form an open cover  $\mu$  of  $Y_1 \times Y_2$  by letting  $\mu = \mu_1 \times \mu_2$ , a "product cover", and the product map  $F = f_1 \times f_2$  of  $X_1 \times X_2$  onto  $Y_1 \times Y_2$ . It follows from Lemma 4.4 that  $f_1^{-1}(\mu_1) \times f_2^{-1}(\mu_2) = F^{-1}(\mu)$ , and since  $f_i^{-1}(\mu_i) R \alpha_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $F^{-1}(\mu) R (\alpha_1 \times \alpha_2)$  as we observed prior to the theorem. Therefore, since  $\alpha$  is arbitrary  $X_1 \times X_2 \leq Y_1 \times Y_2$ .

**Corollary 4.6:** Let  $X_i \leq Y_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , where  $n$  is any positive integer and each  $X_i$  is compact. Then  $\prod_{i=1}^n X_i \leq \prod_{i=1}^n Y_i$ , and each  $\alpha$ -map may be chosen to be a product map with the corresponding  $\mu$  a product cover.

**Proof:** Each open cover  $\alpha$  of  $\prod_{i=1}^n X_i$  may be chosen to be a finite collection of basis elements and has a refinement of the form  $\prod_{i=1}^n \alpha_i$ , where  $\alpha_i \in \Sigma(X_i)$  is also finite. The proof then follows by induction.



Theorem 4.7: Let  $A$  be an index set with  $X_a \leq Y_a$  for each  $a \in A$  and each  $X_a$  is compact. Then  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a \leq \prod_{a \in A} Y_a$  and each  $\alpha$ -map may be chosen to be a product map with the corresponding  $\mu$  a product cover.

**Proof:** If  $\alpha$  is an open cover of  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$ , then  $\alpha$  can be taken to be a finite collection of basis elements since  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$  is compact. If  $U$  is any member of  $\alpha$ , then  $U = \prod_{a \in A} U_a$ , where  $U_a = X_a$  for all  $a \in A - \Delta'$  with  $\Delta'$  a finite subset of  $A$  and for all  $a \in \Delta'$ ,  $U_a$  is an open subset of  $X_a$ . Hence there is a finite subset  $\Delta$  of  $A$  such that  $P_a(\alpha) = \alpha_a = \{X_a\}$ , the trivial open cover of  $X_a$ , for all  $a \in A - \Delta$ ; and for  $a \in \Delta$ ,  $P_a(\alpha) = \alpha_a$  is a non-trivial open cover of  $X_a$  and the proof is thus reduced to working with this finite subset of  $A$ . Corollary 4.6 will be used to obtain the result.

We first consider the set  $\Delta$ . Using Corollary 4.6 we have

$\prod_{a \in \Delta} X_a \leq \prod_{a \in \Delta} Y_a$ . Thus for the open cover  $P_\Delta(\alpha) = \alpha_\Delta$  of  $\prod_{a \in \Delta} X_a$  there is an open cover  $\mu_\Delta = \prod_{a \in \Delta} \mu_a$  of  $\prod_{a \in \Delta} Y_a$  and a product mapping  $F_\Delta$  of  $\prod_{a \in \Delta} X_a$  onto  $\prod_{a \in \Delta} Y_a$  such that  $F_\Delta^{-1}(\mu_\Delta) \cap \alpha_\Delta \neq \emptyset$ . That is,  $F_\Delta = \prod_{a \in \Delta} f_a$  for  $\alpha_a$ -mappings  $f_a$  of  $X_a$  onto  $Y_a$ . For  $a \in A - \Delta$  we have  $\alpha_a = \{X_a\}$ , and any map  $f_a$  of  $X_a$  onto  $Y_a$  is an  $\alpha_a$ -map for  $a \in A - \Delta$ . Then let  $F$  be defined by  $F = \prod_{a \in A} f_a$ , where  $f_a$  is as described above. Form an open cover  $\mu$  of  $\prod_{a \in A} Y_a$  by letting  $V \in \mu$  if and only if  $P_\Delta(V) \in \mu_\Delta$ , and for  $a \in A - \Delta$  we need not be particular about  $P_a(V)$  as we have observed. It follows from this construction that  $F^{-1}(\mu) \cap \alpha \neq \emptyset$ .  $\alpha$  is arbitrary and hence  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a \leq \prod_{a \in A} Y_a$ .

The last theorem on product spaces is a partial converse of Theorem 4.7. Compactness of the coordinate spaces is not necessary for this theorem, but some other restrictions are necessary.

Theorem 4.8: Let  $A$  be an index set and  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a \leq \prod_{a \in A} Y_a$ . Suppose that for

each open cover  $\alpha$  of  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$  there is an  $\alpha$ -map which is a product map  $F = \prod_{a \in A} f_a$ . Then  $X_a \leq Y_a$  for all  $a \in A$ .

Proof: Let  $a' \in A$  be arbitrary and  $\alpha'$  be an open cover of  $X_{a'}$ . The collection of open sets  $\prod_{a \in A} U_a$ , where  $U_{a'} \in \alpha'$  and  $U_a = X_a$  for  $a \neq a'$ , is an open cover  $\alpha$  of  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$ . By hypothesis there is a product map  $F$  on  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$  onto  $\prod_{a \in A} Y_a$  and an open cover  $\mu$  of  $\prod_{a \in A} Y_a$  such that  $F^{-1}(\mu) R \alpha$ . Furthermore, the component  $f_{a'}$  of  $F$  which maps  $X_{a'}$  onto  $Y_{a'}$  is continuous. If  $P_{a'}$  is the projection mapping of  $\prod_{a \in A} Y_a$  onto  $Y_{a'}$ , then  $P_{a'}(\mu)$  is an open cover  $\mu'$  of  $Y_{a'}$  since  $P_{a'}$  is an open mapping. We may assume that  $\mu$  consists of basis elements for there is always a refinement of  $\mu$  of this form. Then since  $V \in \mu$  implies  $F^{-1}(V)$  is contained in some member of  $\alpha$ ,  $f_{a'}^{-1}(P_{a'}(V))$  is contained in some element of  $\alpha'$ . This follows from Lemma 4.4. Thus  $f_{a'}^{-1}(\mu') R \alpha$ , and since  $\alpha'$  and  $a'$  are arbitrary,  $X_{a'} \leq Y_{a'}$  for all  $a' \in A$ .

## V. METRIZATION AND EMBEDDING

## A. Metrization and Generalizations and the Countability Axioms

If  $X$  is  $T_1$  and  $X \leq Y$  where  $Y$  is regular, then, as we have seen,  $X$  is regular. Since a regular second countable  $T_1$  space is metrizable, we might ask whether metrizability itself is inherited. Perhaps just as interesting is the same question with regard to the countability axioms and some of the generalizations of metric spaces.

We will examine two generalizations of metric spaces, uniform spaces and developable spaces. We first look at the relation between uniform spaces and metrizable spaces, and obtain our only positive result with regard to the questions in the preceding paragraph. The discussion below on uniform spaces is taken from Kelley(8), Chapter 6.

**Definition 5.1:** A uniformity for a set  $X$  is a non-empty family  $\mathcal{U}$  of subsets of  $X \times X$  such that

- (1) each member of  $\mathcal{U}$  contains the diagonal  $\Delta = \{(x, x) : x \in X\}$ ;
- (2) if  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , then  $U^{-1} = \{(x, y) : (y, x) \in U\} \in \mathcal{U}$ ;
- (3) if  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ , then  $V \circ V \subset U$  for some  $V \in \mathcal{U}$ ; ( $V \circ V = \{(x, z) : \text{for some } y, (x, y) \in V \text{ and } (y, z) \in V\}$ )
- (4) if  $U, V \in \mathcal{U}$ , then  $U \cap V \in \mathcal{U}$ ; and
- (5) if  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $U \subset V \subset X \times X$ , then  $V \in \mathcal{U}$ .

The pair  $(X, \mathcal{U})$  is a uniform space; and the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  of the uniformity  $\mathcal{U}$ , or the uniform topology, is the family of all subsets  $T$  of  $X$  such that for each  $x \in T$  there is a  $U \in \mathcal{U}$  such that  $U[x] = \{y : (x, y) \in U\} \subset T$ .

Uniform spaces can be obtained in the following manner. A uniformity

is assigned to each family of pseudo-metrics for a set  $X$ , and every uniformity is derived in this fashion from the family of uniformly continuous pseudo-metrics. A uniformity can be derived from a single pseudo-metric if and only if the uniformity has a countable base. Since a  $T_1$  pseudo-metrizable space is metrizable, it follows that a  $T_1$  uniform space is metrizable if and only if the uniformity has a countable base.

Each uniform space is homeomorphic to a subspace of a product of pseudo-metric spaces. Then since a space is completely regular if and only if it is homeomorphic to a subspace of a product of pseudo-metric spaces, it follows that uniform spaces coincide with completely regular spaces. Thus we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.2:** If  $X$  is  $T_1$ ,  $Y$  is a uniform space, and  $X \leq Y$ , then  $X$  is a uniform space.

Next we look briefly at developable spaces.

**Definition 5.3:** A topological space  $X$  is developable if and only if there exists a sequence  $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  of open coverings of  $X$  such that the following conditions are satisfied: (i) for each  $n \in \mathbb{I}^+$ ,  $G_{n+1} \text{RG}_n$ ; (ii) for each  $x \in X$  and each open set  $U$  containing  $x$ , there exists an integer  $N = N(x, U) \in \mathbb{I}^+$  such that  $G_N^*(x) \subset U$ . The sequence  $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  is called a development for  $X$ . A space  $X$  will be called uniformly developable if and only if  $X$  has a development  $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  such that for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  there exists an integer  $n(\alpha) \in \mathbb{I}^+$  such that  $G_{n(\alpha)}^*(x) \subset \alpha^*(x)$  for all  $x \in X$ .

Bing (1) proves that if a regular developable  $T_1$  space is collectionwise normal then it is metrizable. He also proves that paracompactness implies collectionwise normality, and hence a regular developable  $T_1$  space

which is paracompact is metrizable. An unanswered question is whether or not each normal developable  $T_1$  space is metrizable.

The following theorem exhibits an important property of the space that will be used in getting a negative answer to the question of the inheritance of developability.

**Theorem 5.4:** Let  $X$  be the set of real numbers, and let a basis for  $X$  be the collection of all half-open intervals, closed on the left. If  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ , then there is a countable refinement of  $\alpha$  consisting of disjoint basis members.

**Proof:** If  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ , then there is a refinement  $\alpha'$  of  $\alpha$  consisting entirely of basis elements.  $X$  is Lindelöf and hence there is a countable subcollection of  $\alpha'$ ,  $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ , which covers  $X$  and each  $I_n$  is of the form  $[a_n, b_n)$ . From  $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  we will construct the desired open cover.

We begin by taking  $I_1$  and noting that then  $I_2 - I_1$  is empty or contains at most two disjoint basis elements of  $X$ . We can also observe that for each  $m$ ,  $I_m - \bigcup_{k=1}^m I_k$  is a finite collection of disjoint basis elements, at most  $m$  of them, which we indicate by  $I_{m1}, I_{m2}, \dots, I_{mk(m)}$ . Then the collection  $\{I_{mn} : m \in \mathbb{I}^+, n = 1, \dots, k(m)\}$  is a countable collection of disjoint basis elements which covers  $X$  and is a refinement of  $\alpha$ .

**Example 5.5:** Let  $X$  be the space described in Theorem 5.4. We observe that  $X$  is first countable, since for each  $x \in X$  a countable neighborhood system can be defined by  $N_n(x) = [x, x + 1/n)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{I}^+$ . We also note that  $X$  is  $T_2$ , separable, normal, and paracompact as well as being Lindelöf.

Let  $Y$  be the positive integers with the discrete topology and let  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ . By Theorem 5.4, there is a countable refinement  $\alpha'$  of  $\alpha$

consisting of disjoint basis members of  $X$ . (If  $\alpha$  is finite, then we can always get an infinite refinement  $\alpha'$  from some member of  $\alpha$ .) Let  $f$  be a one to one function between members of  $\alpha'$  and points of  $Y$ . That is, the members of  $\alpha'$  can be ordered by  $I_1', I_2', \dots$ , and let  $f(I_n') = n$  for each  $n \in I^+$ . Clearly  $f$  is continuous and if  $\mu$  is the discrete cover of  $Y$ ,  $f^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha'$  and hence  $f^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha$ .  $\alpha$  is arbitrary and so  $X \leq Y$ .

The space  $Y$  is metrizable. It also satisfied all the conditions of Definition 5.3 and is hence uniformly developable. For the collection of singleton sets of  $Y$  can be taken as a development. That is,  $G_1 = G_2 = \dots$ . However,  $X$  is not developable. For Sims (13) has shown that  $X$  is not semi-metrizable and a  $T_1$  developable space is semi-metrizable.

Here, of course, the space  $X$  is not second countable, for every basis contains sets of the form  $[a, b)$  for each real number  $a$ .

We will conclude this section with an example in which the first axiom of countability is also not inherited under the relation  $\leq$ .

Example 5.6: Let  $X = [0, 1]$  and let a basis for  $X$  consist of singleton sets,  $\{x\}$ ,  $x \neq 0$ , and all sets containing zero, each of whose complement is countable. Let  $Y$  be the positive integers with the discrete topology. We note that both  $X$  and  $Y$  are Lindelöf,  $T_2$ , and regular.  $Y$  is of course both first and second countable.

Let  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  and let  $0 \in U \in \alpha$ . Then  $X - U$  is countable. If  $X - U$  is infinite, define a function  $f$  on  $X$  by letting  $f(U) = 1$ , and let  $f$  be any one to one function on  $X - U$  onto  $Y - \{1\}$ . Clearly  $f$  is continuous, for each singleton set in  $X - U$  is open, and likewise the singleton sets in  $Y$ . If  $X - U$  is finite, we extract a countably infinite set of points

from  $U$ , different from zero, so that we have a new open set  $U' \subset U$  which contains zero and such that  $X - U'$  is countably infinite. Thus an  $\alpha' \in \Sigma(X)$  is obtained such that  $\alpha' R \alpha$  and also a mapping  $f$  as described above.

It is clear that the mapping  $f$  thus constructed is an  $\alpha$ -mapping, and since such a mapping can be constructed for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ ,  $X \leq Y$ . However,  $X$  is not first countable, for there is no countable local base at zero.

### B. An Embedding Theorem

Let  $F$  be a family of functions such that each  $f \in F$  is on a space  $X$  onto a space  $Y_f$ . There is a natural mapping of  $X$  into the product  $\prod_{f \in F} Y_f$  which is defined by mapping a point  $x$  of  $X$  into the member of the product whose  $f$ -th coordinate is  $f(x)$ . Thus we have the following definition.

**Definition 5.7:** The evaluation map  $e$  is defined by  $e(x) = \{f(x)\}_{f \in F}$ ; i.e.  $P_f \circ e(x) = f(x)$ , where  $P_f$  is the projection of  $\prod_{f \in F} Y_f$  onto  $Y_f$ .

**Definition 5.8:** A family  $F$  of functions on  $X$  distinguishes points if and only if for each pair of distinct points  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  of  $X$  there is an  $f \in F$  such that  $f(x_1) \neq f(x_2)$ . The family distinguishes points and closed sets if and only if for each closed subset  $A$  of  $X$  and each point  $x$  of  $X - A$  there is an  $f \in F$  such that  $f(x) \notin \overline{f(A)}$ .

The above brief discussion and definitions, and the following lemma are found in Kelley (8, pp. 115-116).

**Lemma 5.9:** Let  $F$  be a family of continuous functions, each member being on a topological space  $X$  to a space  $Y_f$ . Then:

- (1) The evaluation map  $e$  is a continuous function on  $X$  to the

product space  $\prod_{f \in F} V_f$ .

- (2) The function  $e$  is an open map of  $X$  onto  $e(X)$  if  $F$  distinguishes points and closed sets.
- (3) The function  $e$  is one to one if and only if  $F$  distinguishes points.

We now return to  $\alpha$ -mappings and their relation to the above discussion.

**Lemma 5.10:** Let  $X$  be a  $T_1$  space and suppose that for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  there is an  $\alpha$ -map  $f_\alpha$  of  $X$  onto a space  $Y_\alpha$ . Then the family  $F$  of  $\alpha$ -mappings of  $X$  distinguishes points, and points and closed sets.

**Proof:** Since  $X$  is  $T_1$  we need only show that  $F$  distinguishes points and closed sets. Thus let  $A$  be a closed subset of  $X$  and let  $x \in X - A$  be arbitrary. Since  $X$  is  $T_1$ ,  $U_1 = X - A$  and  $U_2 = X - \{x\}$  are open sets containing  $x$  and  $A$ , respectively, but  $A \cap U_1 = \emptyset$  and  $x \notin U_2$ . Let  $\alpha = \{U_1, U_2, X - (A \cup \{x\})\}$ . Then  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  and by hypothesis there exists an  $\alpha$ -map  $f_\alpha$  of  $X$  onto a space  $Y_\alpha$ , hence an open cover  $\mu$  of  $Y_\alpha$  such that  $f_\alpha^{-1}(\mu) \cap \alpha$ .

Let  $y \in \overline{f_\alpha(A)}$ . Then every neighborhood of  $y$  contains a point of  $f_\alpha(A)$ . Hence if  $y \in V \in \mu$ , then there is an  $a \in A$  such that  $f_\alpha(a) \in V$ . But  $f_\alpha^{-1}(V) \subset U_2$ , and since this is true of every  $y \in \overline{f_\alpha(A)}$ , it follows that  $f_\alpha(x) \notin \overline{f_\alpha(A)}$ .

Thus from Lemma 5.10 we have that any family  $F$  of mappings of a  $T_1$  space  $X$  which contains an  $\alpha$ -mapping for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  distinguishes points and also points and closed sets.

**Theorem 5.11:** Let  $X$  be a  $T_1$  space and suppose that for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  there is an  $\alpha$ -map  $f_\alpha$  of  $X$  onto a space  $Y_\alpha$ . Then  $X$  is homeomorphic to a subspace



of the product space  $\prod_{\alpha \in \Sigma(X)} Y_\alpha$ .

**Proof:** Define the evaluation map  $e$  by letting  $e(x) = \{f_\alpha(x)\}_{\alpha \in \Sigma(X)}$  for each  $x \in X$ . By Lemma 5.10 the family  $F$  of  $\alpha$ -maps distinguishes points, and points and closed sets. Then by Lemma 5.9,  $e$  is one to one, open, and continuous, hence a homeomorphism.

We note that this embedding is such that the projection to the coordinates of  $e(X)$  is actually onto the spaces  $Y_\alpha$ . That is,  $P_\alpha(e(X)) = Y_\alpha$ . It is also worthy of note that Theorem 2.2 is actually a corollary of Theorem 5.11. For in the earlier theorem  $f$  was an  $\alpha$ -map for all  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$ .

Ponomarev (12) proved the following two theorems.

Theorem 5.12: A necessary and sufficient condition that a  $T_2$  space  $X$  be paracompact is that for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  there is an  $\alpha$ -map  $f_\alpha$  of  $X$  onto a metric space  $Y_\alpha$ .

Theorem 5.13: A necessary and sufficient condition that a regular space  $X$  be Lindelöf is that for every  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  there is an  $\alpha$ -map  $f_\alpha$  of  $X$  onto a separable metric space  $Y_\alpha$ .

In view of our observations in Chapter I with regard to Maxwell's results we may state the following variants of Ponomarev's theorems.

Theorem 5.12': A necessary and sufficient condition that a space  $X$  be paracompact is that for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  there is an  $\alpha$ -map  $f_\alpha$  of  $X$  onto a paracompact space  $Y_\alpha$ .

Theorem 5.13': A necessary and sufficient condition that a space  $X$  be Lindelöf is that for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  there is an  $\alpha$ -map  $f_\alpha$  of  $X$  onto a Lindelöf space  $Y_\alpha$ .

Applying Theorem 5.11 to Theorems 5.12 and 5.13 yields the following

results.

Theorem 5.14: A necessary and sufficient condition that a  $T_2$  space  $X$  be paracompact is that there is a homeomorphism  $e$  of  $X$  into a product of metric spaces  $\prod_{\alpha \in \Sigma(X)} Y_\alpha$  such that  $P_\alpha \circ e$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping of  $X$  onto  $Y_\alpha$ .

Proof: The existence of the homeomorphism of  $X$  if  $X$  is paracompact follows from Theorems 5.11 and 5.12. If the homeomorphism  $e$  exists, then  $X$  is paracompact by Theorem 5.12.

Theorem 5.15: A necessary and sufficient condition that a regular  $T_1$  space  $X$  be Lindelöf is that there is a homeomorphism  $e$  of  $X$  into a product of separable metric spaces  $\prod_{\alpha \in \Sigma(X)} Y_\alpha$  such that  $P_\alpha \circ e$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping of  $X$  onto  $Y_\alpha$ .

Proof: The existence of the homeomorphism when  $X$  is Lindelöf follows from Theorems 5.11 and 5.13. If the homeomorphism exists, then  $X$  is Lindelöf by Theorem 5.13.

## VI. QUOTIENT SPACES AND TOPOLOGICAL GROUPS

## A. Quotient Spaces

**Definition 6.1:** If  $Q$  is an equivalence relation on a set  $X$ , then  $X/Q$  is defined to be the family of equivalence classes. If  $A \subset X$ , then  $Q[A] = \{y: (x,y) \in Q \text{ for some } x \in A\}$ . The quotient map of  $X$  onto  $X/Q$  is the function  $P$  whose value at  $x$  is the equivalence class  $[x]$  to which  $x$  belongs. Thus if  $x \in X$ , then  $p(x) = [x]$  (8, pp. 96-97).

**Definition 6.2:** If  $X$  is a space with topology  $\tau$ , then the set  $X/Q$  is given the quotient topology of  $P$ , which will be indicated by  $\tau/Q$ . (See the discussion preceding Example 2.4.) Thus if  $\mathcal{A} \subset X/Q$ , then  $P^{-1}(\mathcal{A}) = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A$ , and  $\mathcal{A}$  is open (closed) relative to  $\tau/Q$  if and only if  $\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A$  is open (closed) in  $(X, \tau)$ . The pair  $(X/Q, \tau/Q)$  will be called a quotient space.

If  $(X/Q, \tau/Q)$  is a quotient space, then there is another topology on  $X$  which is obtained from the quotient space in the following manner. If  $P$  is the quotient map of the set  $X$  onto  $X/Q$ , then the product topology of  $P$  on  $X$  will be indicated by  $\tau_Q$ . Thus  $U \in \tau_Q$  if and only if  $U = P^{-1}(V)$  for some  $V \in \tau/Q$ .

There are instances in which there are equivalence relations  $Q$  such that  $(X, \tau) \leq (X, \tau_Q)$  and/or  $(\bar{X}, \bar{\tau}_Q) \leq (\bar{X}, \bar{\tau})$ , and we wish to investigate this occurrence. Before proceeding with this, however, we should note that each  $\tau_Q$  as defined above is such that  $\tau_Q \subset \tau$ . It also should be pointed out that if there is any nondegenerate element  $[x]$  in  $X/Q$ , then  $(X, \tau_Q)$  cannot be even a  $T_0$  space. Hence the topologies  $\tau_Q$  have very

little in the way of separation properties.

The spaces  $(X, \tau_Q)$  and  $(X/Q, \tau/Q)$  are related by the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.3:** If  $(X/Q, \tau/Q)$  is a quotient space, then  $(X, \tau_Q) \leq (X/Q, \tau/Q)$ .

**Proof:** The quotient map  $P$  is an  $\alpha$ -map of  $(X, \tau_Q)$  onto  $(X/Q, \tau/Q)$  for all  $\alpha$  when  $\tau_Q$  is the product topology of  $P$ . For  $U \in \tau_Q$  if and only if there is a  $V \in \tau/Q$  such that  $P^{-1}(V) = U$ .

Thus for each equivalence relation  $Q$  the pair of spaces  $((X, \tau_Q), (X/Q, \tau/Q))$  belongs to a class in which there is an  $\alpha$ -mapping for all  $\alpha$ , of the first space onto the second. (Compare this with the discussion in Chapter II.)

The following theorems give some conditions under which  $(X, \tau_Q) \leq (X, \tau)$  and/or  $(X, \tau) \leq (X, \tau_Q)$ .

**Theorem 6.4:** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space and  $Q$  an equivalence relation on  $X$ . If  $(X/Q, \tau/Q) \leq (X, \tau)$ , then  $(X, \tau_Q) \leq (X, \tau)$ .

**Proof:** By Lemma 6.3,  $(X, \tau_Q) \leq (X/Q, \tau/Q)$ . Then by the transitivity of the relation  $\leq$  the theorem follows.

**Remark:** The hypothesis  $(X/Q, \tau/Q) \leq (X, \tau)$  is not as restrictive as it might seem in view of a theorem of R. L. Moore. Moore's theorem states that if  $X/Q$  is any nontrivial upper semicontinuous decomposition of a plane  $(X, \tau)$  into continua not separating  $X$ , then  $(X, \tau)$  and  $(X/Q, \tau/Q)$  are in fact homeomorphic (15). Much interest is centered on the extension of this theorem to higher dimensional spaces.

**Theorem 6.5:** Let  $(X, \tau)$  be a topological space,  $Q$  an equivalence relation on  $X$ , and  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X, \tau)$ . Then  $\alpha < \tau_Q$  if and only if  $Q[U] = U$  for all  $U \in \alpha$ , and both of these imply that the identity map  $i: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \tau_Q)$  is an

$\alpha$ -map.

Proof: We will first show that  $\alpha \subset \tau_Q$  if and only if  $Q[U] = U$  for all  $U \in \alpha$ . Observe that  $\alpha \subset \tau_Q$  if and only if  $U \in \alpha$  implies  $U \in \tau_Q$ ; and  $U \in \tau_Q$  if and only if  $U = P^{-1}(V')$  for some  $V' \in \tau/Q$ . Then  $U$  is a union of equivalence classes and it follows that  $U = Q[U]$ .

To prove the other half let  $Q[U] = U$  for all  $U \in \alpha$ . Then  $U$  is a union of equivalence classes, and hence there is a  $U' \subset X/Q$  such that  $P^{-1}(U') = U$ . Then  $U' \in \tau/Q$ . Since  $\tau_Q$  is the product topology of  $P$  it follows that  $U \in \tau_Q$ . Therefore,  $\alpha \subset \tau_Q$ .

To prove the theorem, note that  $i$  is continuous because  $\tau_Q \subset \tau$ . If  $\alpha \subset \tau_Q$ , then clearly  $i$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping, for  $i^{-1}(\alpha)R\alpha$ .

**Definition 6.6:** If  $\Sigma(X)$  is the family of open coverings of a space  $X$ , then a subcollection  $\Sigma'(X)$  is called a cofinal family of coverings of  $X$  if and only if for every  $\alpha \in \Sigma(X)$  there is an  $\alpha' \in \Sigma'(X)$  such that  $\alpha' R\alpha$ .

**Corollary 6.7:** Let  $\Sigma'(X, \tau)$  be a cofinal family of open coverings of  $(X, \tau)$  and suppose that for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma'(X, \tau)$  there is an equivalence relation  $Q = Q(\alpha)$  such that  $\alpha \subset \tau_Q$ . If each  $(X, \tau_Q) \leq (Y, \sigma)$ , a fixed space, then  $(X, \tau) \leq (Y, \sigma)$ .

Proof: Let  $\alpha \in \Sigma'(X, \tau)$  be given and  $Q$  the corresponding equivalence relation such that  $\alpha \subset \tau_Q$ . Then by Theorem 6.5 the identity mapping  $i: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \tau_Q)$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping. Hence there is a  $\mu \in \Sigma(X, \tau_Q)$  such that  $i^{-1}(\mu)R\alpha$ . By hypothesis there is a  $\mu$ -mapping  $f$  of  $(X, \tau_Q)$  onto  $(Y, \sigma)$ . Then  $f \circ i$  is an  $\alpha$ -map of  $(X, \tau)$  onto  $(Y, \sigma)$ , and since  $\alpha$  is arbitrary,  $(X, \tau) \leq (Y, \sigma)$ .

To illustrate the use of Theorems 6.4 and 6.5, and Corollary 6.7,

consider the following example.

**Example 6.8:** Let  $X = [0,1]$  and define a topology  $\tau$  on  $X$  as follows.

Let  $\{x\} \in \tau$  if  $x \neq 0$ . If  $0 \in U$ , then  $U \in \tau$  if and only if  $X - U$  is finite.

Define an equivalence relation  $Q$  on  $X$  by letting  $[x] = \{x\}$  if  $x$  is irrational. If  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are any two distinct rationals, then  $[r_1] = [r_2]$ .

It is easily seen that the quotient space  $(X/Q, \tau/Q)$  and  $(X, \tau)$  are homeomorphic. Hence by Theorem 6.4,  $(X, \tau_Q) \leq (X, \tau)$ .

To show that  $(X, \tau) \leq (X, \tau_Q)$ , let  $\alpha'$  be any open cover of  $(X, \tau)$ . Then if  $0 \in U \in \alpha'$ ,  $X - U$  is finite. Let  $\alpha$  be such that  $U \in \alpha$  and if  $x \in X - U$ ,  $\{x\} \in \alpha$ . Then  $\alpha R \alpha'$ . Define an equivalence relation  $Q(\alpha)$  by letting  $[0]$  contain the points of any countably infinite subset  $A$  of  $U$  such that  $0 \in A$ , and  $[x] = \{x\}$  if  $x \in X - A$ . Obtaining  $\tau_{Q(\alpha)}$  from  $(X/Q(\alpha), \tau/Q(\alpha))$ , it is clear that  $\alpha \subset \tau_{Q(\alpha)}$ . Hence by Theorem 6.5, the identity  $i: (X, \tau) \rightarrow (X, \tau_{Q(\alpha)})$  is an  $\alpha$ -map.

For each  $\alpha' \in \Sigma(X, \tau)$  there is an  $\alpha$  as above such that  $\alpha R \alpha'$ , and it is clear that the corresponding space  $(X, \tau_{Q(\alpha)})$  is homeomorphic to  $(X, \tau_Q)$ . Hence  $(X, \tau_{Q(\alpha)}) \leq (X, \tau_Q)$ , and it follows from Corollary 6.7 that  $(X, \tau) \leq (X, \tau_Q)$ .

## B. Topological Groups

Before proving a theorem on compact topological groups, some background on topological groups is necessary. The discussion that follows is taken from Montgomery and Zippin (11).

**Definition 6.9:** A topological group  $G$  is a space in which  $G$  is a group, and the functions  $f$  and  $g$  defined by  $f(x) = x^{-1}$  and  $g(x,y) = xy$  are con-

tinuous on  $G$  and  $G \times G$ , respectively. Unless otherwise indicated, when we refer to a group it will be a topological group.

**Definition 6.10:** When a subset  $H$  of a group  $G$  is an abstract group, then  $H$  will be called a (topological) subgroup of  $G$ ,  $H$  being given the relative topology.

**Lemma 6.11:** Let  $G$  be a group,  $A$  an open subset of  $G$ , and  $b$  an element of  $G$ . Then  $Ab$  and  $bA$  are open.

**Theorem 6.12:** Let  $G$  be a group and let  $A$  and  $B$  be subsets of  $G$ . Then if  $A$  or  $B$  is open,  $AB$  is open.

If  $G$  is a group satisfying any of the  $T_1$  axioms, then  $G$  is  $T_2$  and, in fact, completely regular.

**Definition 6.13:** A homomorphism of a group  $G$  is a group homomorphism which is continuous. An isomorphism is a group isomorphism and a space homeomorphism.

**Definition 6.14:** If  $G$  is a group and  $A \subset G$ , let  $A^{-1} = \{a^{-1} : a \in A\}$ . A set  $A$  is called symmetric if and only if  $A^{-1} = A$ .

If  $U$  is a neighborhood of the identity  $e$ , then  $U^{-1}$  is a neighborhood of  $e$  and  $U \cap U^{-1}$  is a symmetric neighborhood of  $e$ .

**Theorem 6.15:** Let  $G$  be a group and  $U$  a neighborhood of  $e$ . Then there exists a symmetric neighborhood  $W$  of  $e$  such that  $W^2 \subset U$ .

If  $B = \{V\}$  is a local base at  $e$ , then  $xV$  is an open set containing  $x$  for each  $V \in B$ . Hence  $xB = \{xV\}_{V \in B}$  is a local base at  $x$  for each  $x \in G$ .

Let  $G$  be a group and  $H$  a subgroup of  $G$ . The sets  $xH$  and  $yH$  for  $x, y \in G$  either coincide or are disjoint. Each set  $xH$  is called a left

coset of  $H$ . The notation  $G/H$  is used to represent the set of all left cosets of  $H$ . If  $H$  is an invariant subgroup, i.e.  $xH = Hx$  for all  $x \in G$ , then  $G/H$  is an abstract group, the abstract factor group, with topology to be specified below.

**Definition 6.16:** The natural map  $T$  of a group  $G$  onto the abstract factor group  $G/H$  is defined by  $T(x) = xH$  for  $x \in G$ .

**Definition 6.17:** Let  $G$  be a group and  $H$  a subgroup of  $G$ . By an open set in  $G/H$  is meant a set whose inverse image under the natural map is an open set in  $G$ .

Thus the factor group  $G/H$  is given the quotient topology of  $T$ . Note that for any subset  $U$  of  $G$ ,  $T(U) = UH$  and hence  $T$  is open. It is also true that  $T^{-1}(T(U)) = UH$ .

The necessary machinery to prove the following theorem is now available.

**Theorem 6.18:** Let  $G$  be a group, and let  $\{G_a\}_{a \in A}$  be a family of arbitrarily small invariant subgroups of  $G$  for some index set  $A$ . Then if  $\alpha \in \Sigma(G)$ , there is an  $a \in A$  such that the natural mapping  $T_a: G \rightarrow G/G_a$  is an  $\alpha$ -mapping.

**Proof:** Let  $\alpha \in \Sigma(G)$ . Then if  $V \in \alpha$  and  $x \in V$ ,  $xU \subset V$  for some  $U$  in a local base at  $e$ . Furthermore, since  $U$  is a neighborhood of  $e$ , there is a symmetric neighborhood of  $e$ , call it  $W$ , such that  $W^2 \subset U$ . Then clearly  $W \subset U$  and  $xW \subset xU$ . Let  $\mu$  be a refinement of  $\alpha$  consisting of open sets of the form  $xW$ , where each  $W$  is as described above.  $G$  is compact, and hence there is a finite subfamily of  $\mu$ , call it  $\mu'$ , which covers  $G$ . The family  $\mu'$  can be indicated by  $\{x_i W_i\}_{i \leq n}$ , where  $n$  is a positive integer.



Since  $G$  has arbitrarily small invariant subgroups, there is an  $a \in A$  such that  $G_a \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^n W_i$ . Let  $T_a: G \rightarrow G/G_a$  be the natural map of  $G$  onto the factor group  $G/G_a$ . Observe that  $T_a(x_i W_i) = x_i W_i G_a$ . Since  $\{x_i W_i\}_{i \leq n}$  is an open cover of  $G$ , it follows that the family  $\{x_i W_i G_a\}_{i \leq n} = T_a(\mu')$  is an open cover of  $G/G_a$ . Furthermore,  $T_a^{-1}(x_i W_i G_a) = x_i W_i G_a \subset x_i W_i^2 \subset x_i U$ , so it follows that  $T_a^{-1}(T_a(\mu')) \in \mathcal{R}\mathcal{Q}$ . Thus  $T_a$  is an  $\alpha$ -map, and since  $\alpha$  is arbitrary, the theorem is proved.

This theorem and Lemmas 5.9 and 5.10 are used in obtaining a group  $G$  as the inverse limit of an inverse system of factor groups of  $G$ . A brief discussion of inverse systems and inverse limits is given below (6, pp. 91-94).

**Definition 6.19:** An inverse system of sets  $\{X, P\}$  over a directed set  $A$  is a function which attaches to each  $a \in A$  a set  $X_a$ , and to each pair  $a, b$  such that  $a < b$ , a map

$$P_{ab} : X_b \rightarrow X_a$$

such that

$$P_{aa} = \text{identity}, a \in A,$$

$$P_{ab}P_{bc} = P_{ac}, a < b < c \text{ in } A.$$

**Definition 6.20:** Let  $\{X, P\}$  be an inverse system of sets over the directed set  $A$ . The inverse limit  $X_\infty$  of  $\{X, P\}$  is the subset of the product  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$  consisting of those points  $x = \{x_a\}_{a \in A}$  such that for each relation  $a < b$  in  $A$ ,  $P_{ab}(x_b) = x_a$ .

If the sets  $X_a$  are groups, then the functions  $P_{ab}$  are assumed to be homomorphisms as defined in Definition 6.5.  $X_\infty$  is given the relative

topology as a subset of the product space  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$ , and when each  $X_a$  is a group then  $X_\infty$  is a subgroup of  $\prod_{a \in A} X_a$ .

Let  $G$  be a compact group which is  $T_0$ , hence is a  $T_2$  space. Let  $\{G_a\}_{a \in A}$  be a family of arbitrarily small closed invariant subgroups of  $G$ . Then  $A$  can be made into a directed set by writing  $a < b$  in  $A$  if and only if  $G_b \subset G_a$ . Then the family  $\{H, P\}$ , where  $H_a = G/G_a$  and for  $a < b$ ,  $P_{ab}: G/G_b \rightarrow G/G_a$  is the natural mapping, is an inverse system of groups. Thus we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.21:** Let  $G$  be a compact group which is  $T_2$  and  $\{H, P\}$  an inverse system of factor groups of arbitrarily small closed invariant subgroups  $G_a$  of  $G$ . Then  $G$  is isomorphic to  $G_\infty$ , the inverse limit of  $\{H, P\}$ .

**Proof:** Consider the family  $\{T_a\}_{a \in A}$  of natural mappings of  $G$  onto  $H_a = G/G_a$ . By Theorem 6.18, for each  $\alpha \in \Sigma(G)$  there is a  $T_a$  which is an  $\alpha$ -map, and by Lemma 5.10 the family of  $\alpha$ -maps distinguishes points, and points and closed sets. Then by Lemma 5.9 the mapping on  $G$  defined by  $f(g) = \{T_a(g)\}_{a \in A}$  is an isomorphism of  $G$  into  $\prod_{a \in A} G_a$ . Using the facts that all the subgroups  $G_a$  are compact, and  $A$  is a directed set, it can be shown that each  $\{x_a\}_{a \in A}$  in  $G_\infty$  is of the form  $\{gG_a\}_{a \in A}$  for some  $g \in G$ . Since these are precisely the elements of  $f(G)$ , the theorem is proved.

## VII. LITERATURE CITED

1. Bing, R. H. Metrization of topological spaces. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* 3: 175-186. 1951.
2. Borsuk, K. Remarques sur las quasi-homeomorphie. *Colloquium Mathematicum* 6: 1-4. 1958.
3. Fort, M. K., Jr. Epsilon maps of a disk onto a torus. *Bulletin de L'Academie Polonaise des Sciences Serie des Sciences Mathématique, Astronomiques et Physiques* 7: 51-54. 1959.
4. Ganea, T. Epsilon mappings onto manifolds. *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 47: 35-44. 1959.
5. Hall, D. W. and Spencer, G. L., II. *Elementary topology*. New York, N. Y., John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1955.
6. Hocking, J. G. and Young, G. S. *Topology*. Reading, Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. 1961.
7. Hurewicz, W. and Wallman, H. *Dimension theory*. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press. 1941.
8. Kelley, J. L. *General topology*. New York, N. Y., D. Van Nostrand, Inc. 1955.
9. McGrath, F. J. Set properties induced by subsets of lesser cardinality. Unpublished M.S. thesis. Ames, Iowa, Library, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1962.
10. Maxwell, C. N. An order relation among topological spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 99: 201-204. 1961.
11. Montgomery, D. and Zippin, L. *Topological transformation groups*. New York, N. Y., Interscience Publishers, Inc. 1955.
12. Ponomarev, V. On paracompact and finally-compact spaces. *Soviet Mathematics* 2: 1510-1512. 1961.
13. Sims, B. T. Some properties and generalizations of semi-metric spaces. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Ames, Iowa, Library, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1962.
14. Ulam, S. *A collection of mathematical problems*. New York, N. Y., Interscience Publishers, Inc. 1960.
15. Whyburn, G. T. Decomposition spaces. In Fort, M. K., Jr., ed. *Topology of 3-manifolds and related topics*. pp. 2-4. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1962.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to take this opportunity to express his appreciation to Dr. D. E. Sanderson for suggesting the topic, and for his invaluable criticisms and suggestions in the preparation of this thesis.